



Paper No. 27

KAREN B DOW  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE  
SUITE 500  
SAN DIEGO CA 92130-2332

COPY MAILED

JUN 07 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of  
Boehringer, et al.  
Application No. 08/812,616  
Filed: March 6, 1997  
Attorney Docket No. 273102007800

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

ON RENEWED PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b),  
filed on May 31, 2002.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to  
timely file a proper response to the non-final Office action  
mailed September 1, 2000, which set a shortened statutory period  
for reply of three months. On March 5, 2001, petitioner (through  
previous counsel) filed an amendment, made timely by obtaining a  
three month extension of time and including a Certificate of  
Mailing dated March 1, 2001. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed  
on May 8, 2001. In response, petitioner filed a petition to  
withdraw the holding of abandonment on June 23, 2001, citing the  
timely filed amendment of March 5, 2001. However, this petition  
was denied in a decision mailed on August 23, 2001.<sup>1</sup>  
Accordingly, the above-identified application was abandoned as of  
March 2, 2001.

Petitioner filed a petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b) on  
January 7, 2002. However, this petition was dismissed in a  
decision mailed on April 24, 2002. The petition was dismissed  
because the accompanying amendment failed to *prima facie* place  
the application in condition for allowance. When filing an  
amendment in response to a final Office action, only an amendment  
that *prima facie* places the application in condition for  
allowance serves as the proper reply under 37 CFR 1.137(b)(1).  
However, a more careful review of the application file confirms  
that the Office action mailed on September 1, 2000 was **not** a  
final Office action. Rather, the September 1, 2000 Office action  
was a non-final Office action that vacated the previous final  
Office action mailed on February 23, 2000.

<sup>1</sup> The petition was denied because it was determined that the March 5,  
2001 amendment did not constitute a *bona fide* attempt to advance the  
application to a final Office action.

With the instant petition, petitioner has met the requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.13(b). The petition fee and the required reply (an amendment) were previously submitted with the earlier petition on January 7, 2002.

The Notice of Appeal submitted with the instant petition has **not** been entered, although a copy will remain in the application file.

The application file is being forwarded to Technology Center 1600 for consideration of the amendment filed January 7, 2002 (paper no. 22).

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-0272.



Cliff Congo  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy